1 2

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

1011

12

13

1415

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

2526

27

28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

OMARR L. BURNETT,

Plaintiff,

v.

DEPUTY FRAYNE, et al.,

Defendants.

No. C 09-04693 SBA (PR)

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFF'S FIFTH REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

On May 4, 2011, Defendants filed their motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff's opposition to Defendants' motion for summary judgment was due on December 30, 2011; therefore, it is currently overdue.

Before the Court is Plaintiff's "Motion to Stay" (docket no. 63), in which he requests a "stay in proceedings" because he is

without a Professional Attorney needed to meaningfully represent his claims, the SVSP's law library is woefully deficient, Plaintiff is a lay person without any formal civil training in Civil law, that Plaintiff is going home on February 12[,] 2012 etc; and that in the interests of justice the action should be heard and granted.

(Pl.'s Mot. to Stay at 1.)

The Court notes that Plaintiff has already received previous extensions of time to file his opposition to the motion for summary judgment. The original deadline for his opposition was July 5, 2011, but it was extended to August 15, 2011 when the Court granted Plaintiff's second request for an extension. On August 25, 2011, Plaintiff's third request for an extension was also granted, and he was given until September 30, 2011 to file an opposition. Finally, Plaintiff's fourth request for an extension was granted, and, as mentioned above, he was given until December 30, 2011 to file an opposition. Therefore, Plaintiff has already received one hundred forty-seven (147) additional

¹ The Court notes that Plaintiff's first request indicated that the deadline to file his opposition was on "June 7, 2011"; therefore, he had requested an extension up to and including "July 4, 2011." (June 5, 2011 Req. for EOT at 1.) The Court granted his request in an Order dated June 13, 2011. However, the Court notes that Plaintiff's opposition was actually due on July 5, 2011, sixty days after the motion for summary judgment was filed. Therefore, Plaintiff's first extension request was not necessary.

further extensions of time will be granted in this case.
later than February 29, 2012. This is the final extension that will be given to Plaintiff, and no
opposition no later than February 3, 2012. Defendants' reply to the opposition must be filed no
motion for summary judgment is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. Plaintiff must file his
Accordingly, Plaintiff's fifth request for an extension of time to file his opposition to Defendants'
Defendants' motion for summary judgment after his release date on February 12, 2012.
Court construes his motion as a fifth request for an extension of time to file his opposition to
appropriate; however, a "stay of proceedings," as Plaintiff requests will not be granted. Instead, the
days to file his opposition. Nevertheless, the Court finds that another very brief extension of time is

This Order terminates Docket no. 63.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: <u>1/27/12</u>

United States District Judge

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE
3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4	
5	
6	OMARR L. BURNETT, Case Number: CV09-04693 SBA
7	Plaintiff, CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
8	v.
9	FRAYNE et al,
10	Defendant.
11	
12	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.
13	That on January 30, 2012, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said
14	
15	located in the Clerk's office.
16	
17	
18	O'Marr L. Burnett F-26842 Salinas Valley State Prison
19	P.O. Box 1050 Soledad, CA 93960-1050
20	Dated: January 30, 2012
21	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: LISA R CLARK, Deputy Clerk
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	